

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/727,816	HOOD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Robert J. Hoffberg	2835	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Robert J. Hoffberg. (3) _____
 (2) Joseph R. Mencher, Reg. No. 56,822. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 28 February 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1,7,14,21 and 22.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed meaning of last limitation (starting with "the resilient load member" and ending with "not transferred to the processor socket") of independent claims 1, 7, 14, 21 and 22. It is understood by the examiner, after this interview, that the secondary force is a non-compressive force exerted by the curved resilient load member (when the resilient load member is deformed into a substantially parallel engagement) on the frame member and not on the processor socket. Applicant proposed changing the last limitation of claims 1, 7, 14, 21 and 22 to "whereby the deformation of the curved resilient load member into a substantially parallel engagement with the processor results in a non-compressive force that is not transferred to the processor socket due to the coupling of the curved load member to the frame member." Examiner is going to examine the application based upon the non-compressive force is not transferred to the processor socket due to coupling of the curved load member to the frame member.